

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, December 10, 2024, by Council Vice-President Liz Strader.

Members Present: Liz Strader, John Overton, Doug Taylor and Anne Little Roberts.

Members Absent: Robert Simison, Luke Cavener, Brian Whitlock.

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Bill Parsons, Sonya Allen, Linda Ritter, Tracy Basterrechea, Steve Taulbee and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input type="checkbox"/> Brian Whitlock
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anne Little Roberts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Overton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doug Taylor	<input type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Strader: Welcome to the City of Meridian's City Council regular meeting. Today is Tuesday, December 10th at 6:00 o'clock p.m. We will begin this regular meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Strader: Please join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Strader: Thank you. We will invite Rabbi Batsheva Appel to do the community invocation. Please join me in prayer or a moment of silent reflection.

Appel: Eternal One, creator of all, as we come together this evening for this meeting of the City Council to do the business of this city, bless our elected officials and all those who work on behalf of the inhabitants of Meridian. Give them strength and patience, wisdom and discernment, understanding and insight as they do work that shapes the contours and the lives of this city. May the work that is accomplished on this evening be balanced and just as they consider the needs of all those living in this city and how the -- and how these decisions lean into the future. Grant success to all their endeavors and blessings to all of us and let us say amen.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Strader: Thank you, Rabbi. Okay. Next up we have adoption of the agenda.

Overton: Council Vice-President?

Strader: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Seeing as there are no changes to the agenda this evening, I move that we adopt and approve the agenda as published.

Little Roberts: Second.

Strader: Okay. We have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda as published. All those in favor, please, signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Development Agreement (Brundage Estates H-2024-0031) Between City of Meridian and Centers Farm LLC and L.C. Development Inc. for Property Located at 3770 S. Linder Rd.**
- 2. Approve Funding for City of Meridian Project 11239 in Conjunction with Ada County Highway District Project 520023 for the not-to-exceed amount of \$1,313,718.05**
- 3. Grant Agreement: Community Health Academy Grant from Blue Cross of Idaho Foundation for Health, Inc.**
- 4. Consent to Vacate Ada County Highway District Right-of-Way at Clover Meadows Subdivision No. 3 Between Don & Linda Huffman (Neighbor), Jamie & Wendy Luderman (Neighbor), and the City of Meridian**
- 5. Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Amendment in the amount of \$26,131.00 for a Firehouse Subs Grant award from the Firehouse Subs Public Safety Foundation, Inc. for the purchase of Rope Rescue Equipment**
- 6. Resolution 24-2494: A Resolution Amending the City of Meridian Records Retention Schedule; and Providing an Effective Date**

Strader: Next we have the Consent Agenda.

Overton: Council Vice-President?

Strader: Councilman Overton.

Overton: There are no changes to the Consent Agenda. I move that we approve the Consent Agenda, for the Council Vice-President to sign and the Clerk to attest.

Little Roberts: Second.

Strader: Okay. Thank you. We have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and the Consent Agenda is approved.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Strader: Okay. Next we have the public forum. Mr. Clerk, is there anyone signed up under public forum?

Johnson: Madam Vice-President, there are no sign-ups.

ACTION ITEMS

- 7. Public Hearing Continued from November 19, 2024 for Skyranch (H-2024-0022) by Laren Bailey, Conger Group, located near the NE Corner of S. Meridian Rd. and E. Lake Hazel Rd.**
 - A. Request: Annexation of 20.039 acres from RUT in Ada County to the R-15 zoning district.
 - B. Request: Rezone of 24.53 acres of land from R-4 to R-15 zoning district.
 - C. Request: Modified Development Agreement to create a new development agreement for the construction of the proposed single-family residential development.
 - D. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 285 (284 new and 1 existing) and 36 commons lots on 43.82 acres in the proposed R-15 zoning district

Strader: Okay. Thank you. All right. With that we are going to be moving into the Action Items of this evening's agenda. Anyone in the audience is welcome to stay for the Action Items, but you are not obligated to stay if you have other plans. Okay. With that we will go ahead and move on to Item 7, the public hearing continued from November 19, 2024, for Skyranch, H-2024-0022, and we will begin this City Council public hearing with staff comments. Ms. Ritter.

Ritter: Good afternoon. Thank you, Madam Chair -- Madam President. My apologies. Council Members, at the November 19 public hearing staff was directed to work with the applicant to develop -- to develop and present appropriate conditions of approval. Following this directive staff engaged with the applicant and has now presented to Council a set of conditions deemed suitable for this application. Again, this application is for annexation of 20.039 acres of land with R-15 zone, rezoning of 24.53 acres of land from R-4 to R-15, modification of the existing development agreement to create a new one to develop the proposed single family residential and preliminary plat consisting of 285 building lots, 28 common lots, six common drives on 43.82 acres of land. So, while staff and the applicant have reached consensus on the majority of the conditions, there were a couple that remain in disagreement and those are Condition 1-F. It talks about Tarrega Lane. This is a condition that was required by ACHD and so we thought we would add it to the development agreement and, then, also Condition 2-C, we are asking for R-8 size lots at the northern portion of the boundary adjacent to the large estate lots. We were talking about the lots that were abutting Shafer View. So, those are the conditions that staff and the applicant are not in agreement on, but we felt that based on the discussion during the November 19th hearing, as well as comments received thereafter, we believe that the proposed conditions are appropriate and adequately addressed the concerns raised and, then, also there was a condition In ACHD's staff report, a site specific condition that talked about the cross-access to the southern properties. Staff is seeking Council direction based on this. Given the size and configuration of the intersection staff is concerned that the property's development potential may be significantly constrained without this cross-access. So, we would like some direction from Council on that cross-access to the southern property and one of the conditions that we have -- we talk about Councilman Taylor stated about 40 permits per year. The applicant did revise their phasing plan. They came up with seven phases and -- which limits the number of applications that they can submit for per year and, basically, the -- we need to revise that condition, because if we do the phasing plan it will say that within a 12 month period they will not apply for a final plat if that is the consensus of the Council. Staff doesn't have an issue with that. It's better than trying to count permits that come in for approval. So, with that I will stand for any questions that you may have.

Strader: Okay. Thank you very much. Fellow Council Members, are there any questions for city staff?

Taylor: Madam Vice-President?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Quick question. On condition two that was on -- needs to be settled, can you show on the map -- I just want to make sure we are talking about the correct cross-access point that we want to have that easement in place. Is that -- can you just show me where we were talking about exactly?

Ritter: So, over in this area, if I'm correct, there is an easement that is proposed by the applicant for a cross-access across the -- for a road to be built to provide cross-access to this property to the south and so if we are requiring that as a public street ACHD will require them to put -- provide a trust deposit -- a road trust deposit. So, they have -- they have shown on their proposal that easement. So, what we need to decide is are we going to make that public, so that we can get access to that property? Because cross-access is something that we do require as part of our code. So, we are just looking for some direction from the Council on this.

Taylor: Quick follow up. Can you just clarify is the -- the easement will exist, but the question is whether or not we would require them to put the ACHD requirement to put some money in it. Was it --

Ritter: A road trust fund.

Taylor: A road trust --

Ritter: Uh-huh.

Taylor: -- fund for a future date if that -- if that becomes a public road access.

Ritter: Right. So --

Taylor: Am I understanding correctly?

Ritter: From my understanding they will be providing part of it and the property to the south would be providing the other half when it develops for the development of that.

Taylor: Madam Vice-President, just another -- one more follow up. On the -- the direction we provided at the last one on the 40 lots -- so, they have agreed to seven phases, so that, essentially, that 40 lots becomes cumbersome and because there is the seven phases it kind of addresses that concern. Okay. Thank you.

Strader: Okay. Council, any further questions for staff at this time? Okay. With that we will go ahead and recognize the applicant for up to 15 minutes.

Clark: Good evening, everybody. Madam Chair. Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street in Boise. Representing the applicant. And I do want to clarify a couple of items on those conditions of approval. So, I think the first item that I would clarify is that there is no agreement on the -- or no disagreement on the condition regarding to Tarrega Lane. We are -- we are in agreement with that. I had had a conversation with Linda and Bill about it indicating that it was unnecessary, because the written -- the -- sub parts one and three are unnecessary, because we have as a statutory matter the right to relocate that roadway, but we are fine with that language being there. We are not -- we are not opposing that one. So, I think the other items that were out there -- we were aware of two. We had worked with staff to whittle down from about half a dozen and so we were

happy about that. So, with regard to the number of units per year, you know, as I mentioned at the last hearing we had represented and we were comfortable with the average of 40 units per year. How to allow staff to be able to track that easily was kind of where the rub was and as you guys can imagine and probably -- and understand building permits versus platted lots is kind of two different questions. Platting requires you to extend roads, get common areas in, utility connections, so being able to average the 40 on just phasing is a little bit more complicated. So, what we did was we revised the phasing plan to try to hit the intent of -- I think it was Council Member Cavener that suggested that and we are in agreement with staff on that phasing plan. I think what we had discussed earlier today was just replacing that condition. I think it was A1D to just simply say that we would adhere to the phasing plan dated today's date and, then, the -- I think -- you know, one other item that was out there -- well, let me -- let me back up. With regard to the ACHD connection -- so, we discussed this at the last hearing and this is the location of where that easement is located. So, when ACHD did their review they did not require a stub in that location, because I think for obvious reasons it's not a particularly beneficial stub when it comes to the kind of cost of maintenance of a bridge over the Rawson Canal, given how close you are to the intersection. You literally are just a couple hundred feet to be able to walk around or drive around and get into that area, but in light of staff's concerns about access and connectivity, we offered up a compromise, which was that we would preserve that easement in that location, so that if in the future when the -- that parcel below us develops that opportunity is still there. But, again, ACHD has not required a stub in that location. The only reason that a road trust would be required is if the city said we disagree with you, ACHD, we think there should be a stub and, then, that would -- that's what would trigger the language that's in the ACHD report. But ACHD has taken the position that a stub is not necessary. We have tried to go above and beyond by providing that easement. Okay. So, last item is really just this question of the buffer or the transition I guess I should say on the north above our mixed use regional area and, you know, a couple items on this one. You know, there was some discussion at the last hearing -- the maker of the motion for the continuance -- you know, I don't know that the intent there for the continuance was to make any modifications to the -- to the layout. I think some of the other comments were pretty clear on that, but I'm happy to discuss it and if you look at the issue I think it comes down to the question that the Mayor talked about during our last conversation and that is when we looked at these questions are we planning for what is in the county today or what will be in the city when those areas develop? In other words, is -- are we planning for -- are we transitioning against county lots or are we transitioning against future city lots? And so if we look at what it is in the city, which is, obviously, the answer to the question, what is that? These are the density bands that are provided. So, the properties for a medium density project is three to eight. Medium high density eight to 12. Mixed use regional six to 40. So, for the areas on our east we provided and agreed, after conversations with those folks, that we would do single story product. That would preserve the views and provide for a more open feeling. You know, if we are required to lose the lots over there, then, I think we would have to revisit that question and look at what that mitigation actually ends up being for. With regard to the areas north of the mixed use area, I think what we have provided -- and we talked about this a little bit last time -- is very consistent with what is already existing on the other side. So,

if you are looking at this map you see proposed Sky ranch down at the bottom, that's mixed use regional. If you look at Prevail neighborhood at the top, that's medium density residential and, then, the area in the -- in the middle is low density residential. Mixed use density -- or excuse me -- mixed use regional calls for an overall kind of a higher density, medium density just a little bit lower than that. So, as you are coming from the medium density on the north at 5.638 dwelling units per acre, you transition into Shafer View Terraces at 1.73, which wraps around the existing Shafer. We are at 6.5, pretty similar to Prevail, just a little bit more dense, which is appropriate according to the comprehensive designation and you go into vacant land that's going to wrap Shafer View, very similarly to Shafer View Terraces, at a density that we anticipate would be fairly similar and, again, that's 13 acres. It's right now open with proposed densities that are proportionate to what's on the other side of that low density block. So, you know, from our perspective we think that that is addressed. Again, we don't think it was consistent with what the maker of the motion for the continuance had -- had -- had discussed, but we did want to go through that one more time just to try to address any concerns. So, with that I don't think I have any other comments, Madam Chair.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Clark. Council, do you have any questions for the applicant at this time? Okay.

Taylor: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just a really quick question. So, on the cross-access, this application -- the easement will be maintained. ACHD did not require the stub. So, I might just be missing a fact. In terms of the -- the suggestion of putting money in the -- this fund, is that what we think would be an ACHD requirement or is that something the city staff was asking as part of that requirement?

Clark: So, the -- the -- the only circumstance under which that would trigger is -- let me back up. Right now ACHD says no stub. So, that means no road trust, because it's not anticipated currently to be an ACHD roadway. The only reason it would become an ACHD roadway is if the city said we disagree with you, ACHD, we want a stub to go into that location. If that's the case, then, the road trust would be triggered. In the meantime what we have done is to preserve the easement, so that if, you know, something unexpected happens on the property to our southeast, some reason that that connection becomes something that ACHD wants or is beneficial, then, that opportunity would be there, but as it currently stands that's not something that ACHD is requiring.

Strader: I would actually like to ask city staff to, please, clarify their perspective on that in terms of what ACHD is requiring versus what the planning staff believes should be required and if you don't mind just getting into some detail on that, I think that would help all of us. Thank you.

Parsons: Certainly happy to provide some context on that topic. So, really the -- the ACHD report has punted to us, meaning the city to say whether or not we want a stub street there and if we do, then, that's when that road trust kicks in. So, Linda had showed you that condition, that's right out of ACHD's condition of approval and that's why we thought it was an important topic to share with you tonight, because it -- if we get an easement, then, it may or may not happen. If we require the stub road, then, the applicant has to put up a road trust, but keep in mind that if it doesn't happen they get the money back after a certain time frame. So, it's -- again, a lot of this is going back to the conversation we had a couple weeks ago, is we just don't know what that nine acre piece is going to be in the future and right now it's R-4, but we all recognize that access is a challenge -- going to be a challenge to that property and that's why we have to preserve some kind of connectivity with this neighborhood from -- from the Comprehensive Plan and the code's perspective that what our code requires and that's why we are a little bit difference of opinions from ACHD is we think there should be connectivity to the neighborhood regardless if this is commercial or residential in the future, having something stubbed there or plan to connect to that piece in the future is going to be critical just given the location and the proximity to that intersection that's currently just been rebuilt in conjunction with Brighton and currently functioning and will be even widened more in the future, I would imagine, when they do the ultimate build out. So, really keep that -- and that's why it's important to us to make sure that we get it right and let -- we want to get your opinion on that, because, again, ACHD what we don't want to have happen is they come in for a final plat and we don't have that issue resolved and, then, it's too late. So, it's something that we should really -- at least let note on the record and, then, that way when the applicant comes in with that phase of the final plat we will make sure that whatever condition's in place would be adhered to at that time.

Strader: Mr. Parsons, could you just explain -- and I think it would be helpful for everybody -- what are the concerns if that -- if that did not occur, what do you believe are the impacts potentially of that on the surrounding area or just connectivity in general? What I don't have and actually would be helpful probably, turn it over to you soon, is just understand kind of what the distance actually is from that intersection. It's not -- you know, there is no key on the maps, so it's kind of unclear what kind of distances there are in terms of what ACHD normally requires. Like I believe ACHD normally requires a certain distance, you know, from an intersection to access parcels. So, I just kind of wanted to clarify maybe first with staff and, then, we can go to Mr. Clark.

Parsons: Sure. Madam Vice-Chair, Members of the Council, it -- as you mentioned there is -- there is a threshold both by ACHD and city code. So, first ACHD requires 660 offset, I believe, for full access off -- off of that and they are well within that. So, again, keep in mind when Brighton did that cooperative development agreement with ACHD to widen Lake Hazel from Meridian Road to Locust Grove, that was the determination -- that's where ACHD and Brighton and this developer worked on the access point for -- to be in this area. So, that -- that is a set point and that was discussed at the last hearing. Now, when we are talking right-in, right-out, that's a different threshold. That's usually

two -- 220'ish, somewhere in that realm to get a right-in, right-out. In our code when you are adjacent to a state highway like this property, we require a backage road or frontage road to the state highway and the offset in our code is 660 as well. So, that's where that net number comes in to align with probably ACHD's requirements at the time when the code went into effect. So, that's pretty consistent. So, really, the ramifications for this if we don't get that connection point, then, at some point the city and ACHD are going to determine what the appropriate access points will be for that remainder piece on the corner, which means we will have to give them a right-in or right-out access at a very congested, very busy intersection that could be potentially seven lanes in the future, which makes it pretty difficult to develop and that's why we are trying to set this piece up so that regardless of what it is in the future -- I don't know if it will be commercial. I don't know if it will be residential. I don't know what it will be and that's -- that's where planning staff is struggling a little bit on this application, because we just don't know what this is going to be now that this other piece is developing around it and so I think it's something that we are going to have to take a look at in the future and determine how we want to rectify the situation, because at this point it's not being integrated with this piece and so it's very difficult to say how it's going to develop and what's going to go there. So, those are some of the -- the concerns that planning has about just disregarding this and not providing that connectivity. We have to make sure that there is safe access and the only access at this time -- it's going to be a lot of vehicles stacking at that intersection onto Lake Hazel. That will be a signalized intersection and so you are routing all the traffic to that area until such time as we get other connection points to disperse the traffic through the sub -- the subdivisions as well. So, keep that in mind and that's a very short distance for stacking vehicles -- for that number of vehicles at that intersection as well, because of this particular layout.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Parsons. Mr. Clark, did you have anything to add?

Clark: Yeah. I have got a few things to add. Thank you, Madam --

Strader: Uh-huh.

Clark: So, first of all, the stacking distance that is not a concern at the -- the intersection with Lake Hazel. We talked about that with ACHD. You have got a couple hundred feet there and there will be a left turn lane. So, it's not just a single lane of stack, it's two lanes of stack, so there is -- there is not a concern with that backing up there. We actually talked about that with ACHD and with staff. The -- the other point that I would make -- and that this is not a debate about whether we are going to preserve the connectivity into that property from our property, we have already committed to provide the easement, so that it can be provided in the future. The question is is the city directing to ACHD that we think there should be a stub road right -- right there right now, rather than evaluating that later when the use on that southwest parcel is actually known. We are providing a private easement right now that would allow for construction of a future public road if that's what's desired once that southwest parcel develops. So, we are not foreclosing connectivity. In fact, we are -- we are making that possible for connectivity.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Clark, but isn't it true that if that connectivity were to be required in the future and at that point the economics of building the bridge would fall completely on the southwest parcel?

Clark: That could be the case.

Strader: Thank you. That's helpful. Does anyone else have any further questions for the applicant?

Taylor: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Probably a question for our public safety friends here. Is there -- from your perspective that cross-access that we are talking about is there any public safety implications or concerns that you have with ensuring that the road is stubbed today or in the future or -- I just kind of would be curious what your -- your comments might be, if any, on that.

Taulbee: Madam Vice-Chair, Members of the Council, Councilman Taylor, looking at what is proposed here and working through this with there being more than 30 dwelling units, there is a secondary fire department access route that is required. However, the secondary can be a gated entrance. So, as long as the primary access provides us into and through the development, then, there is no other concerns off the service right now.

Strader: Thank you. Any further questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you. Please stay close by. And with that this is a public hearing that's been continued. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide public testimony?

Johnson: Madam Vice-President, we do. First online is Deb Boyd.

Strader: Okay.

Johnson: And, Deborah, we are bringing up your presentation here.

Boyd: Thank you.

Strader: Just for clarity, Ms. Boyd, are you representing a homeowners association or yourself individually?

Boyd: Just myself individually at 493 East Shafer View.

Strader: Great. Thank you. You will be recognized for up to three minutes.

Boyd: Thank you. I just -- I want to make sure that a concern that I have regarding the Skyranch development and future extension of the road that's from the area that I have

kind of noted there in that red dot -- that there would be a stub road out to the parcel to the north. If you could just move on to the next slide. Just a few notes about the subdivision and that red dot there. The next other -- the other dot I placed there is at the intersection of Meridian Road and Shafer View Drive, which is a -- an intersection that currently does not meet ITD visibility guidelines. It also allows for a left-in, left-out -- -- right-in and out. There are no barriers and no deceleration lane, so you are kind of a sitting duck waiting to turn into Shafer View Drive and my concern is that there would be an extension of the road. That road extension would continue over into Shafer View Drive. The road right now is -- and ITD has done a fabulous job on working with ACHD to ensure that the developments to the north of Shafer View Estates work within the Quartz Creek Road, which turns towards Lake Hazel and turns into Sublimity, that the traffic is pushed onto those roads, rather than coming through Shafer View Drive. The future folks who live in Shafer View Terrace to the north of Shafer View Estates, currently only have emergency access to Shafer View Drive. That emergency exit has been used twice in October. We had drivers hit power poles and take out -- closing the road in both directions. Closing Quartz Creek and those drivers coming out of that area had to use Shafer View Drive and where my concern is this becomes a major access road for those 280 plus Skyranch homeowners, because that would be the fastest route to I-84. If you can move to the next slide. I have put together what the proposed area is. This was a -- the -- on the top there is the proposal that was provided to Shafer View Estates by the future builder of what is expected to be known as Shafer View Ridge Subdivision. The lot sizes are not -- they match up really with what Shafer View Terrace has at the very beginning of Shafer View Drive. There are three lots there to the -- on that upper left corner there, those are three lots that are part of Shafer View Terrace that are accessed through Shafer View Drive and so my concern as you can see there were the extension of this -- the Skyranch Subdivision into through Shafer View Ridge and onto Shafer View -- or onto Shafer View Drive and out to ITD road there and to I-84 -- and that's the easiest access to I-84. My concern is all about traffic coming up that little road there and that ITD is not aware of that future situation there.

Strader: Okay. Does anyone have any questions for Ms. Boyd? Okay. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone else signed up to provide public testimony?

Johnson: Madam Vice-President, next is Sean Lanahan.

Strader: Okay. Welcome, Mr. Lanahan. Please don't forget to state your name and address for the record. You will be recognized for up to three minutes.

Johnson: You might pull that microphone down to you.

Lanahan: Madam Vice-Chair, Council Members, my name is Sean Lanahan. I live in 6190 South Tarrega Lane. I'm here to talk about -- in the last meeting in November we discussed impacts that Skyranch project would have on the existing Tarrega neighborhood and we presented a reasonable solution to minimize those impacts. I have got slides this time to help visualize the challenges and solutions. This is my southern exposure that you can see here. View from my home. A nice sunny winter

afternoon most of my Tarrega neighbors enjoy views like this. As it stands right now with the current development plan there will be eight homes along my southern exposure blocking this view. Two story homes along that property border would likely end up blocking that sun, especially in the wintertime. If you move to slide two.

Strader: I believe you could hit the arrow. We could go ahead and pause his time for a second while we get the presentation working. Okay.

Lanahan: Here is the Tarrega neighborhood as it currently exists. The Whites. The Wakelys. Ericksons. The Burkes. Jackie and my family all have enjoyed nice open expansive views and privacy. The blue lines denote our road that provides a quick access to Lake Hazel Road. The next slide. Here is the current Sky ranch proposal. As you can see in the purple outline my property, the purple outline to the north there, is exactly one acre. Transpose that same amount of space south and you can see that the property density along our property boundaries is equivalent to R-8. I would have eight new neighbors. The Whites would have four in front of their house. The Wakelys would have 11. The Burkes would have 18. Jackie would have seven. That is quite a jump from an existing density of R-1 or less dense to R-8. This severely impacts our privacy, views and southern exposure. Our quick access road to Lake Hazel is also going away. Many of our neighbors have recently put in a lot of money into their remodels, especially the Burkes, who just built a new home, to capture some of that view that will be going away. Please move to slide four. We also understand that we can't hold up progress. We all knew that an incremental increase in density to R-4 was on the horizon. However, we are shocked and disappointed that we are facing the possibility of a jump up to R-8. We are requesting concessions of a feathered transition along our existing property boundaries with Sky ranch to remain at R-4. As you can see in the slide remaining R-4 would reduce --

Strader: Mr. Lanahan --

Lanahan: -- our neighbors --

Strader: -- please wrap it up real quick.

Lanahan: Okay. Again, I think if anyone in this room were to live in our homes you would appreciate the reasonableness of these requests. Thank you for time.

Strader: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Lanahan?

Taylor: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Sean, one question. So, can you just do a little quick math for me from what is proposed versus what you are proposing how many lots are removed?

Lanahan: Yeah. So, I did do that math. Currently there is a proposed 284 lots that we reduce it down to -- by 23 and there would be no alteration to the existing design in doing that.

Strader: Okay. Thank you.

Lanahan: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Clerk, anyone else signed up?

Johnson: Next we have Brian White.

Strader: Okay. Mr. White, once you come forward, please, remember to state your name and address for the public record.

White: Thank you. My name is Brian White. I live at 6180 South Tarrega Lane, Meridian. And I appreciate Sean's view. I was wondering if you could put up that last slide again. I just want to add my support to what Sean's -- my neighbor Sean is requesting. We would really love to see a lower density of housing along the borders of the Tarrega Lane properties. I know that a mile over when Lavender Heights was developed they backed up to Black Rock Subdivision. The Black Rock Subdivision requested a lower density and they reduced the density from one lot to two lots. The backyards. And I think what Sean has put up here seems like a more smooth and reasonable transition and so our request is that the Conger development surrounding the -- or along the east and south borders of the Tarrega Lane properties would have a lower density as indicated by Sean's drawing and also request that they would follow through with their commitment to have single story homes. I would stand for any questions.

Strader: Okay. Thank you for providing your testimony. Are there any questions? Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Got a question. It would be an acceptable trade off to require single family homes, but not a reduction in the number of lots along the property line or what's your opinion there?

White: Well, they have already been kind enough -- at least on -- across from us. I know they told us that they would do single family homes across from us. I don't think they made that commitment to the Burkes on the west side of Tarrega Lane properties, but --

Strader: And if you don't mind do you mean single story?

White: Single story homes.

Strader: Thank you. Okay. Please continue. All right. Thank you. Are there any additional questions? Okay. Thank you.

White: Thank you.

Strader: All right. Mr. Clerk, who's next?

Johnson: Madam Vice-President, Carsten White.

Strader: Okay. Mr. White, if you could, please, come forward. Please make sure to state your name and address for the public record and you will be recognized for up to three minutes.

C.White: Hi. My name is Carsten White. 6162 South Tarrega Lane, Meridian, Idaho. I think some of the developers that we are working with are going to speak regarding this as well, but this back area where you can see on this picture, which says Whites there, my -- my shop house barndominium is back there and we are planning on hopefully developing that with the city. So, we definitely understand that development is coming around us and we are trying to grow with that and change with it and so what we are asking for -- and I remember John Overton mentioned yesterday -- or last time that you very rarely have someone asking to decrease the density when it comes to a development and -- and, hopefully, we will have an opportunity to do that in front of you here in the next few months, because that's really what we are asking for. We are planning on staying here for the long haul. I live there now. I grew up, you know, my parents' house there and I have two other siblings, two brothers and my sister might even be moving there out -- as well at some point. So, we are planning on making this our long-term home and so we are really just trying to ask for more transition on when it comes to these larger lots, these -- you know, these low density properties that we are planning on with Shafer View acre lots up there and transitioning down to the higher density along the road. So, just keeping those -- I reiterate the point that Sean and Brian made regarding the -- the property lines along Tarrega having lower density lots.

Strader: Okay.

Taylor: Madam Vice-President?

Strader: Yes. Go ahead.

Taylor: Quick question. And I remember you talking about your plans in the future the last time and it's kind of helpful to see here kind of just an interesting question to get your take. It sounds like you are going to bring a lower density proposal at some point down the future. What would your reaction be if the city required a higher density because we want more housing? Would you be okay with that if the city imposed that on you or would you not?

C.White: Yeah, I mean at the end of the day it's your guys' decision. What -- you know, what happens. We -- we don't want higher density when it comes to the development that we are going to propose, but would we adjust to it if -- if it's really required? I'm sure we would make some adjustments, but I guess the biggest point I want to make is I think the, you know, Tarrega has shrunk down as, you know, the Galloways, the Scotts have sold their property to Conger there and the Willimans on the corner there, you know, I know they are planning on selling here and in the near future as well and they are going to sell that as a commercial property, you know. So, there is changes with it and we get that. That happens. The biggest thing is we are -- we like this area and it's -- you know, it's an -- it's a family area. We have Discovery Park down the street. We have -- you know, there is a lot of developments and these awesome sidewalks that we are enjoying, I really like that, you know, and my kids love to be able to ride to the park, but it doesn't -- you have this nice neighborhood of Shafer View. Tarrega, these -- the Burkes just built, you know, a multi-million dollar home. Every house in that neighborhood is -- is developed and -- and established and I don't -- maybe one or two may eventually split a couple times, but you are going to consistently have larger lots there. That's not all going to be developed into the city. So, we are talking about a transition from, you know, really small lots down to large, you know, properties and it just doesn't make sense transition wise when you look at it, even if you don't even look at the -- the county properties, the ones that we will be proposing are still going to be larger lots and -- and on to Shafer View, so --

Strader: Mr. White, would you mind -- do you have an idea of what your plans are in terms of the density that you are expecting or the number of lots that you are expecting in the future? I'm just curious.

C.White: We do. Trevor, do you guys have that with you? So, this is John Brecken with Brecken Land -- Land Design and he can -- he can speak to that a little bit more.

Strader: Mr. Brecken, please, state your name and address for the record.

Brecken: John Brecken. 6661 North Glenwood Street, Garden City. Yeah, we are working on their plan. We are going to submit later this week for the Whites and it will be four one acre lots. It butts right up against Shafer View to the north. Those are all one acre lots.

Strader: Thank you. That's -- that's helpful context. I appreciate that. Okay. Any further questions?

Strader: Okay. Thank you.

C.White: Yeah. And last thing --

Strader: Sorry, there are no further questions. Thank you.

C.White: Okay.

Strader: Mr. Clerk, is there anyone else signed up?

Johnson: Madam Vice-President, that was everyone that signed up.

Strader: Fantastic. All right. Is there anyone present in the audience that would like to provide public testimony? Great. Ma'am, please, come forward. Thank you. Anyone else who would like to provide public testimony on this item, please, go ahead and sit in the front row, so that we know that you are in the queue. Okay. Please state your name and address for the record and you will be recognized for up to three minutes.

M.. White: Marcella White. 6180 South Tarrega Lane, Meridian, Idaho. So, I was at the last meeting also in November and it didn't dawn on me -- I mean I'm all about lower density for sure. We grew up -- you know, we have had nine acres, 33 and a half years and I realize its -- farms are sold and that's what happens, but like everybody else, it's a little disconcerting to see so many houses right up against our property lines. Lower density would be great. But the thing that really caught me last month when I was looking at this map was the routes in and out, because now all of a sudden we are going to lose our private lane; right? We have to come in off of Sublimity on the east or Lake Hazel over here and those are the only two entrances or exits for this whole subdivision, which is 280 something houses, which is a lot. So, now I have to drive past all these houses and, you know, it's just a lot. It's just a lot for somebody that's lived out in the country. So, with this lower density it would -- we would be able to come in and kind of enjoy a little bit bigger lot size. I know people want yards, too. I mean I have plenty of people ask if they can -- you know, we want to sell them some land. There is people that want to have a little bit more space between the houses. So, I know they would sell. I think there would be a great asset to this development having some bigger lot sizes right there next to us. Like we have all said, we are all planning on staying. We are keeping four acres. We are going to develop only five -- the back five -- into the city and we are keeping our four, because we still enjoy the country and we want to have some space. So, I would just appreciate you considering thinking about the traffic also and just the connectivity where it's minimal. There is no way out onto Meridian Road and so we will just have a lot of cars that are going to be coming at those two -- you know, if you think of 280 houses, two cars, possibly up to 600 cars that could be coming and going all during the day. That is a lot. So, I would just like you to consider that.

Strader: Okay. Does that conclude your testimony? All right. Thank you. Are there any questions for her? Okay. Thank you very much. All right. Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to provide public testimony on this item? Okay. Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody online?

Johnson: Madam Vice-President, it looks like aside from those who already spoke just city staff.

Strader: Okay. All right. With that we will go ahead and turn it over to the applicant for the final word. You have up to ten minutes. Thank you.

Clark: Thank you. Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street. And while Linda is bringing up my slides with regard to Ms. Boyd's comments with regard to connectivity, I think the Council is aware that connectivity is not just a priority, but it's a requirement both for ACHD and for the city, that connectivity, even though it might seem a little bit scary, actually helps alleviate many of these traffic concerns, because it allows neighborhoods to be connected, for traffic to be dispersed in ways that it wouldn't otherwise be to try to keep people off of those collectors and those major highways, so that die is cast based on city and ACHD requirements. But, you know, we just would offer up some -- some comfort that connectivity really actually does make traffic better, it doesn't make it worse. With regard to -- maybe this thing's frozen. With regard to the transition and some of the comments there --

Strader: Is there a technical issue, Mr. Clerk?

Clark: We got a little bit of a glitch here. Okay. I think it's -- I think it's awake now. Okay. So, we did receive a copy of the -- the White Subdivision draft plat from Mr. Brecken and wanted to just chat about this a little bit in light of the question that I mentioned earlier, which is that question of what are we developing against what is in the county or are we developing what will be in the city? And this makes this point pretty stark. This is not a question -- and we run into this all the time. You guys hear this all the time. You know, the neighbor that says I have got my five acres. I'm never leaving. It's always going to be five acres. And so you need a transition to that and, then, three years later we see that property up for sale. That's not even what we are talking about here. This property is already being proposed for redevelopment in the city and that redevelopment will be -- if we are going to adhere to the comp plan, will be a medium density residential project. It's -- that's what the Comprehensive Plan calls for. So, it would be -- it would be calling for more lots than -- than what is shown here. But that is -- that goes to this question of -- of what are we transitioning against? If we are transitioning against something that's going to develop in the city, it's -- we are going to be developing -- or transitioning against something that's going to be medium density residential and it's medium density residential for a reason. As you all know, all these nice amenities that we have, especially in that part of town, parks, regional pathways, fire stations, they don't pay for themselves with large lot densities, they pay for themselves if we have the densities that we have planned for at a higher rate and so I think with that, you know, I think I probably conclude -- oh, other than to just say that our project does provide all of the ingress and egress that's required under code. It's not just two ways in and two ways out. As that -- as that project -- area develops those stubs move in and out of all the other adjoining neighborhoods and, then, if the -- if this project moves forward I would anticipate that there would be another connection on to the collector on our east side that would continue to the north. So, it won't be just coming through our neighborhood if it actually does develop. So, with that, Madam Chair, I think I would conclude.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Clark. I -- we appreciate that. Are there any questions based on that?

Overton: Council Vice-President?

Strader: Council Member Overton.

Overton: Hethe, backing up a ways. Can you tell me what the original idea of the city was for the zoning density on that parcel of land that we are talking about, the one that backs up on the far east side of your development -- backs up to the north.

Clark: Let me see --

Overton: R-15?

Clark: Maybe this is -- helps, Council Member Overton. So, the -- the Comprehensive Plan designation, if that's -- if that's what you are -- you are speaking to -- because Meridian is a little different in that not all of the Comprehensive Plan designations specify this zone works in this area, right, in the mixed -- in the -- excuse me -- the mixed use regional it says R-15 is a permitted zone, but we don't have that same checklist there for medium density or medium high density, but what we do have is that the city is planning for three to eight dwelling units per acre in all of that yellow area that we were just showing on the map.

Overton: And it was up to R-15 on the mixed use regional; is that correct?

Clark: R-15 is one of the allowed zones within the mixed use regional. That's correct.

Overton: I just want to say that to follow up with a comment. I made a comment early on about lower densities and that was one of the things that I appreciated is most of the times when we see stuff we see if there is a -- if it's allowed to be an R-15 it seems like what we are getting is an R-15 and to see this coming in at 6.5 residential units per acre -- I was extremely happy to see that. I realize when you look at all the houses it looks like a lot, but you have to remember overall that that's what we are looking at is 6.5 and that's still currently your plan?

Clark: That's correct.

Strader: Thank you. Are there any further questions or comments for the applicant specifically? Okay. All right.

Clark: Thank you very much.

Strader: All right, Council, with that we have heard from the applicant. We have taken public testimony. We are at the point of having some discussions and motions.

Taylor: Council Vice-President?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I think at this point it's appropriate to make a motion to close the public hearing on file H-2024-0022.

Overton: Second.

Strader: Okay. We have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. All those in favor say aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The public hearing is now closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Taylor: Madam Vice-President?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I'm just going to make a couple of comments here just to kind of kick off some of the discussion we have. First off, really appreciate the staff working with the applicant on the conditions for approval. That was -- looking through the list here on the updated staff report was -- it was quite a bit of work and so for all of you that worked on that I really appreciate it. I learned a lot in my error in my motion initially in what I was trying to motion. So, I really do think -- thank the staff and the applicant for working together over the last few weeks through the holidays to kind of come up with that. I think a couple comments on those conditions. First, I'm happy to hear the -- kind of the revised phasing plan. That's something that I'm not particularly a big fan of implementing phasing plans. I know out of respect for Councilman Cavener and his -- his wisdom like that it is I appreciate that we found a way to kind of not have an overly burdensome task on city staff for tracking permits, but so I appreciate the applicant with that. Also appreciate knowing Condition 1-F it sounds like that is not outstanding, that the city -- the applicant agrees with what the staff have put in as far as a condition. With respect to the lot sizes I actually did go back and re-watch the hearing earlier this week just to make sure I was following all the ins and outs. It was not my recollection as the initial motion maker to address the lot sizes in any of the motion. I do remember some discussion on it and I don't know that this -- that we had ever come to any conclusion about what we did want to do or not want to do. It wasn't my intent as the motion maker to do anything with that. Certainly we could have that discussion tonight if we think that we would like to do that. But I just wanted to clarify that that was not my intent initially. Really kind of personally fascinated with the idea of the -- the easement, the stub road and this transportation trust. I appreciate the applicant being willing to have the easement in place to kind of ensure that connectivity if we need it. Also, though, kind of found it enlightening as well when staff mentioned the potential for the burden to fall entirely on the property to the south maybe to develop that. So, that's something I'm thinking about. What that means. I do think -- I agree in some respect with the applicant's argument that it's probably not a necessary connectivity, but I don't think we would error if we were to ask to have that. I think it would seem reasonable that we would have that connectivity even though it's fairly close to other bridges and intersections. So, I'm not -- I don't think it's an unreasonable request on the city -- from the city staff to the applicant to -- not just having the easement in place, but also to stub

that property. I do think it's likely that we would probably ask to have the -- have that there in the future. Of course that would be a future city council decision and we wouldn't necessarily impose that, but those are just some of my thoughts at this point. I think, again, really appreciate the staff working on the conditions of approval, finding acceptable conditions to move this -- this project forward considering where -- where we were when this initially started. So, those are some of my comments at this point.

Strader: Okay. Thank you. Are there further comments, further discussion?

Overton: Council Vice-President?

Strader: Councilman Overton.

Overton: One who seconded the motion that brought us here this evening, I echo a lot of what Councilman Taylor said. It is impressive that we have taken where we were at to where we are at tonight. That's a lot of work. I mean we didn't have any conditions of approval when we left last time. Now we have them. We have -- we have a goal in sight and I appreciate all the hard work that went into that for where we are at. Just a couple thoughts similar to what Councilman Taylor mentioned. When we are talking about this I believe it's nine acres that's going to sit on the corner and we are concerned about the connectivity. The one thing that keeps hitting me is we are wanting to reserve or preserve that land and the reason I'm kind of leaning towards just preserving it is I have no idea how that could develop and I'm not sure that making that a requirement of what the person does with those nine acres would screw up or limit the type of development that could go in in that location and maybe I'm overthinking that small parcel of land. I understand the request, the idea for connectivity, I'm just not sure that requiring it right then on that piece of ground that has such a -- it's got a lot of challenges already just because of where it lies with Highway 69 and Lake Hazel and we talked about the traffic and the traffic has been mentioned multiple times. One -- I believe, unfortunately, the first road -- or grade that was given to Lake Hazel on the report that ACHD put out unfortunately still was measuring this road as a two lane, if I'm correct, not the five lane road it is now. So, it's kind of -- we are using some old data on some of the original stuff that ACHD put out there compared to where the road is going to be at five lanes going out to Highway 69. So, the grade of E that they gave the road is not really accurate considering we are going to have a five lane road running out. I think we are going to have the roadway system, the collectors, we are going to have the arterial streets that will be able to handle this traffic and I have to go over it again when I look at density and why I liked the 6.5 dwelling units per acre on this development. We sit up here and we see a lot of developments with a lot higher density than this and there is a lot of them approved in the city and I understand the concerns of folks that live in the county. We still have a lot of developments that run up against county land and we have to make a decision when we develop a plan for how we want to see the city grow and what that's going to look like and that's not necessarily based upon what the parcel in the county next to it is, it's based upon the vision of what the city wants to see in certain areas of the city and how they want to see that grow and it -- it puts us in a tight spot every time, because we don't want to make -- we want to make the best

decisions for the city, what makes the city a better place, while trying to be respectful of what you have in the county and you guys have like a little Garden of Eden back there. It's pretty amazing that you have got that. It's not going to go away. You are going to have a lot of houses around you. But you are still going to have that peaceful place where you live and call home. There is still pockets of that around our city today. I'm very much in support of this, as I was the first night. I'm open for discussion on what we do with the cross-access connection, but I'm very comfortable with simply requiring that that is preserved, because we just don't know what's going to go in on the acres in the corner.

Strader: Okay. Thank you. Any further comments?

Little Roberts: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: And, again, I will echo both comments from my fellow councilmen. Now, these are always difficult as we try to focus on Meridian's vision and I think I'm in total agreement that the 6.5 density is a great way to go in that area and very appreciative that the -- of committing to single story homes near the development. I think that that really helps as far as the neighborhood goes and just greatly appreciative of the staff and the developer working together to get so far that we did from the last time of the discussion. I'm also in agreement with the easement regarding the cross-access. I think that that's a good way to go at this point and leave that preserved.

Strader: Okay. Thank you. I will provide some brief comments just for context. Probably not very surprising. In the last meeting I had a lot of concerns that the applicant chose not to pursue a comp plan amendment, which I believe was the way to go in this case. I still think that city staff should independently consider pursuing a Comprehensive Plan amendment if it can be accomplished and -- and if there is consensus internally to do so, only because it's obvious that geographically what we had planned for wouldn't work here and it's not only this property, unfortunately, that is affected by these decisions, but it -- by approving this one certainly the parcel on the corner and its future use would be much less likely to work as a mixed use regional development. So, I think we should still consider that. You know, I agreed with city staff in their staff report in the last meeting and so I will be voting no on this application tonight. If any motion makers could provide clarity on whether there is a single story requirement and on whether it's just the easement being provided or if you are proposing that the half of the bridge be put in a road trust I think that would be very helpful for all of us to understand. So, with that I think I have said my two cents. Thank you. Okay.

Taylor: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: A quick question on -- maybe it's even a -- if staff could just give me a nod of this is doable or not, but if we were -- I'm trying to find a way to sort of find a satisfactory kind of common ground on the issue of the stub road and the easement issue. Is it -- because my biggest concern is if potentially that the property owner to the south would bear the cost -- entire cost and I -- to me it's just not clear -- as a condition of approval could we require -- or if we were to require the easement to stay in place, but not require them to build that stubbed road, but in the future when that southern property develops require that this -- the applicant pays half of the development of the bridge. Is that something that -- have we done that? Can we do that? Just trying to find sort of a -- maybe what seems like an acceptable common ground that everybody wins.

Strader: Okay. Is there a member of city staff that would like to comment? Mr. Parsons, I see you --

Parsons: Madam Vice-Chair, Members of the Council, it gets a little dicey for us to do that just for the fact that ACHD's policies are that you build the road and, then, put up half the cost, so they -- they don't maintain easements. It's really the city's responsibility and that hasn't worked well for them in the past either. We have had that situation on subdivisions where it was anticipated the easement would be converted to a public street and it wasn't. So, we -- staff has dealt with those issues over time, so that isn't a workable solution in staff's opinion. The best approach is either require the stub street and put up half the cost or as -- as you know, we could require the cross-access easement to remain in place and, then, if something does happen on that site, then, obviously, that owner has to figure out how to get that connectivity across that canal.

Strader: Thank you. Any further questions? Discussion? I'm mulling it over for a moment. Maybe two cents from me. One thing I have noticed with development in the city is that connectivity is the one thing we can never get back if it's not something that we pursue from the outset. So, that's just a caution that I have is what the applicant is proposing would provide the easement, but, economically, I think what the practical result would be is it would fall onto that property owner to the southwest to fund the bridge most likely. At least that seems like a likely scenario if we did not require the stub and the road trust at this time, so --

Little Roberts: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Clarification from Bill. So, it's my understanding that the way that was presented you have had -- we have had easements before that just flat out didn't -- the connectivity didn't happen because the easement was there, but just in your opinion, but the developer later -- why did that go wrong? Why did that not work?

Parsons: Madam Vice-Chair, Members of the Council, the issue was ACHD didn't get the right of way dedicated and so in their mind they couldn't take claim to something or

require something, because it wasn't their property -- or properly conveyed to them. So, that's why in their opinion it became more of a private easement.

Little Roberts: Follow up?

Strader: Please. Go ahead.

Little Roberts: How can that happen? How can ACHD get that so that it's available for them to use? Does it have to be deeded?

Parsons: That is -- well, ACHD requires roadways, local streets and any collector roadway to be constructed and funded by the developer. So, that's why there is no way to grant that -- pay money for road trust for even the construction of the road, but they can do that for the construction of the bridge and put the other half on the adjacent property owner. So, in that -- in this scenario the developer will have to build a road and stub it there, but -- and dedicate the right of way for the bridge and put up half the money and, then, that next person that comes in would extend the road and the bridge to offset that cost and as I mentioned to you the road trusts aren't in perpetuity. There is a time frame on that. So, over time I think -- I believe there is five years is probably the term. I'm not a hundred percent sure on that, but I believe over some time period if nothing happens they get their money back.

Little Roberts: Thank you.

Strader: Thank you, Bill. That's very helpful. I didn't realize the time frame as well. We don't come across this situation with a bridge that often. Okay.

Parsons: Like I said, ten years I guess is that --

Strader: Oh. Okay. Well, ten years and five years are not the same, are they? Yeah. Okay. That's important to know. So, is it ten years, then, Mr. Parsons, or is it five?

Parsons: Madam Vice-Chair, I'm going to go with the applicant. They deal with ACHD more on that. I don't have the answer for you this evening.

Strader: Okay. It sounds like the city attorney believes it's ten as well. Okay. All right. Any further discussion, any further thoughts? Motions?

Taylor: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Uh-huh. Yes, Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I will be prepared to make a motion, since I kind of started the motion making in the last meeting. Strangely, just really kind of going back and forth on whether or not just having the easement in place is sufficient. I'm actually compelled a little bit by your argument about -- if you lose it you lose it forever and I kind of feel like error -- even if

it's not needed at some point down the road when the entire hard corner and everything develops, we may very well look at that and say that's kind of silly, who required this cross access here? Like this does nothing. I also think if we didn't have it we would say that was dumb, why did we not do it? So, probably not the strongest feelings on my part, but I think I'm looking for sort of the -- following some guidance from the staff a little bit on this issue and your argument about, you know, preserving connectivity when we can. So, I think in my motion -- before I make it I just kind of want to indicate what I would do would be to follow the city staff's recommendation to require -- to maintain the easement, but to have the stub street in place with the transportation trust is what I would like to make in the -- in my motion, but I wanted to put that out there if there is any discussion specifically on that that the rest of Council would like to weigh in on.

Strader: Thank you. I think that's very helpful. Fellow Council Members, any reflections or thoughts on that?

Little Roberts: Madam Vice-President?

Strader: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Given the light of your comment once we lose it we lose it and knowing that it really probably wouldn't happen with just an easement, I think I am swayed more to go with the stub street.

Strader: Okay. Thank you Councilman Overton, you look like you might make a comment.

Overton: Well, I have to go back to the applicant's last comments when it came to the stub street to the north and it might be the words he has issued that we live with here tonight and that was we need more connectivity and I have a hard time ultimately saying we need the connectivity to the north, but we don't need it to the south. So, I would be willing to go along with that decision.

Taylor: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: To make a motion.

Strader: Okay.

Taylor: Move we approve File No. H-2024-0022 making note that condition 1-F the applicant agrees and that on Condition A1D that the applicant will adhere to the phasing plan as presented this evening and that the applicant be required as a condition of agreement of a condition of approval to put in a stub street and maintain an easement and that to clarify that the issue of lot sizes is not -- any changes to lot sizes is not included in my condition of approval motion.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Taylor -- or Councilman Taylor. Is there a second or discussion? Or both?

Little Roberts: Well, I will second it.

Strader: Okay. Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: And, Madam Vice-Chair, did we want -- Vice-President, did we want to include anything regarding one or two stories?

Taylor: Madam Vice-Chair, I -- I don't want to put that as a requirement in the conditions of approval. I think that the applicant's been a good neighbor in terms of the community. I think that they said that they would work to do that. So I don't want to place that as a condition to clarify.

Little Roberts: Second agrees.

Taylor: Okay.

Strader: Okay. We have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion before we take a vote? Okay. Mr. Clerk, please, go ahead and call for the vote.

Roll Call: Cavener, absent; Strader, nay; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, absent.

Strader: Okay. The ayes have it and the application is approved. Thank you. Have a nice evening.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE NAY. TWO ABSENT.

8. Public Hearing for Addison Circle Subdivision (H-2024-0040) by Centurion Engineers, Inc., located at 4635 N. Black Cat Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 1.87 acres of land with an R-8 zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of seven (7) building lots and one (1) common lot on 1.87 acres of land.

Strader: Okay. Just to preview for those in the audience, we will -- depending on what we get to, if we get to 8:00 o'clock p.m. we will be taking a short break at that time. Okay? With that let's go ahead and open up Item No. 8, the public hearing for Addison Circle Subdivision, H-2024-0040, and we will go ahead and open this application with staff comments. Sonya.

Allen: Yes, Madam, Council, just one moment here.

Strader: Please take your time. I did not mean to rush you.

Allen: Switching gears here between -- all righty. The next application before you is a request for annexation and zoning and preliminary plat. This site consists of 1.87 acres of land. It's zoned RUT in Ada county and is located at 4535 North Black Cat Road. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is medium density residential, which calls for three to eight dwelling units per acre. The applicant proposes to annex the subject in-fill property into the city with R-8 zoning for the development of seven single family residential detached homes at a gross density of 3.74 units per acre, consistent with the use and density desired in the medium density residential designation. The proposed R-8 zoning is consistent with the zoning of adjacent surrounding properties, also zoned R-8. Staff recommends a development agreement is required as a provision of annexation that includes the provisions in the staff report. A preliminary plat is proposed to subdivide the subject 1.87 acre property into seven building lots and one common lot. Proposed lot sizes range in size from 4,399 to 7,157 square feet, with homes ranging in size from 1,872 to 2,265 square feet. Access is proposed via the extension of West Torana Street and an existing local street stubbed to the west boundary of this property. A cul-de-sac is proposed at the end of Torana Street with no vehicular access allowed via Black Cat Road. Council approval of the dead end street is required as it exceeds the maximum UDC length standard of 500 feet at 545 feet. With approval of the dead end street a pathway connection is required through the common area between the sidewalk along Black Cat and Torana Street. Black Cat Road is scheduled in the CIP to be widened to five lanes between Ustick and McMillan between 2031 and 2035. Because the site is below five acres in size it's exempt from the common open space and site amenity standards in the UDC. A minimum 25 foot wide landscape street buffer is required along Black Cat Road, an arterial street, with a five foot wide detached sidewalk. Sidewalk to the north of this side along North Black Cat Road doesn't extend all the way to the subject property. It stops at the common lot where the canal is located. You can see it here on this photo of the site. There is a pathway that comes from the sidewalk here down. It's asphalt and, then, it stops right in here. There is approximately a 15 foot long gap in that area. Staff is recommending as a provision of the development agreement that a detached asphalt pathway is constructed off site to the north to the existing pathway. Mitigation is required for existing healthy trees that are removed from the site in accord with UDC standards. A mitigation plan is shown on the landscape plan. Conceptual building elevations were submitted for the proposed single family residential homes as shown. Building materials are proposed to consist of a mix of horizontal cottage lap, vertical board and batten and shake lap Hardie board siding with stone and brick wainscot accents and 30 year old architectural shingles. Because structures on Lots 3 and 5, Block 1 -- and that is these lots right here on the end -- will be highly visible from Black Cat Road staff is recommending the sides of homes on these lots incorporate articulation and modulation to break up monotonous wall plains and roof lines that are visible from the subject public street. The Commission recommended approval of these applications. I will go over a summary of the public hearing. Robert Renteria, the applicant, testified in favor, along with Anna Canning from Centurion Engineers. They are the applicant's representative. Written testimony was received from David Crawford, Centurion Engineers, the

applicant's representative and there was really no discussion by Commission or changes to the staff report. Again, the outstanding issue for Council tonight is Council approval is needed of the 545 foot long dead end street as it does exceed the maximum length of 500 feet. No written testimony has been received since the Commission hearing. Staff will stand for any questions

Strader: Okay. Thank you very much. Are there any questions for city staff? Okay. Seeing no questions we will now recognize the applicant for up to 15 minutes to present their project. Welcome. If you could, please, remember to state your name and address for the public record. Thank you.

Crawford: Yes. David Crawford. Centurion Engineers. 2323 South Vista Avenue in Boise. As your staff went through they hit all the high points. This isn't a really complex subdivision. It essentially finishes off a development that was started a number of years ago. We believe it's consistent with the Comprehensive Plan with the neighborhood. During the neighborhood -- our neighborhood meeting there was four or five neighbors that attended and they had no objection to the proposal. Subsequently I had one of the neighbors contact me about a week or so ago and he had no objection to it either. So, I believe that what is being planned here is -- one of the partners is really into aging in place, so all the houses proposed here are going to be single story. So, I believe we -- this will be an attractive addition to the city and it will complete an otherwise undeveloped property and we agree with the conditions of approval as written and I will stand for any questions you have.

Strader: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Crawford. Are there any questions for the applicant? Okay. I did have a question. Thank you. I'm intrigued by who you are kind of targeting, your target market for this and you are not obligated to answer the question, but are you kind of anticipating marking this more towards seniors? You sort of mentioned aging in place. So, I thought I would give you an opportunity to expand on that.

Crawford: Yeah. One of the -- one of the partners in the development is looking forward -- he -- he is active in the City of Meridian. He is also a real estate agent. He thinks this is a good market that people need that's not specifically marketed to. So, that's what he wanted to do was sharpen his pencil and his point and say this is kind of what we want to do here. So, it's going to be more accessible than otherwise would be.

Strader: Thank you. Yeah. The reason I think that is helpful is just the -- just to be very transparent with you, the traffic situation on Black Cat has been really challenging for us. Clearly this is a smaller development to the extent that it's kind of targeted toward that market. I think that -- at least in my mind that kind of helps me put my arms around it just because those folks wouldn't be adding as much to the -- exacerbating the traffic situation along Black Cat. Okay. Thank you. Any further questions for the applicant? Okay. You can go ahead and take your seat and, please, don't go far. We are not exactly bursting at the seams, but this is a public hearing. Mr. Clerk, is there anyone signed up to testify on this one?

Johnson: Madam Vice-President, no.

Strader: Okay. Great. Is there anyone in the audience at this time who would like to provide public testimony on this item? Going once. Going twice? Sold. Okay. Thank you. All right. With that does the applicant have any concluding remarks? Okay. The applicant waives their concluding remarks. With that, Council, any discussion, motions, et cetera?

Taylor: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I got a question for staff. Is there -- obviously, one of the issues we will have to address tonight is the -- to allow the dead end street to be 545 instead of 500. Is there any -- I understand we have to just sort of have reasonable lengths of these streets in our UDC. Is there any concern that staff has with it being 545 versus 500? Because it seems to me it's just a creation of sort of a unique plot of land with what we have. But is there any concerns that you have on the 545?

Allen: No. There is no concerns from staff. There really is no alternatives, since access isn't allowed to Black Cat. So, if it were not approved, then, the plat would have to be denied.

Taylor: Okay.

Strader: Thank you. That's helpful. Okay.

Taylor: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I make a motion that we close the public hearing on File No. H-2024-0040.

Little Roberts: Second.

Strader: Okay. We have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. All those in favor, please, signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Taylor: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just keep the ball rolling here. This seems like a pretty straightforward kind of a nice simple easy proposal. I like what I see. It seems like it makes sense. Seeing that there is no really concerns from any of the neighbors or staff, with one fairly easy to resolve issue as a condition of approval, I'm going to support this tonight. I'm happy to make a motion unless any other members of the Council would like to make some comments or make the motion themselves.

Overton: Council Vice-President?

Strader: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just like to make one comment headed the same way, but normally one of the things I think we are concerned with when we look at a roadway and being longer than what our code normally allows is the fact that we are talking about emergency service access, but it appears that this roadway already was a dead end that had enough turnaround room for fire, but it was stubbed, so it's going to actually have two turnarounds in short proximity of each other and I think that's what's kind of reassuring me that the 545 feet gives me no concern at all as an approval as part of this file tonight.

Strader: Well said. Okay.

Taylor: Okay. Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I make a motion that we approve File No. H-2024-0040 and to clarify that we are going to waive the 500 foot requirement and allow the 545 foot dead end street.

Little Roberts: Second.

Strader: Okay. We have a motion and a second to approve this application. We will go ahead and have the clerk call -- is there any further discussion? Okay. And seeing none we will have the clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, absent; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, absent.

Strader: All right. The ayes have it and this application is approved.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

- 9. Public Hearing for Apex Phenomenal (H-2024-0041) by Brighton Corporation, generally located on the north side of E. Lake Hazel Rd. approximately 1/4 mile west of S. Locust Grove Rd.**

- A. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 64 building lots and 11 common lots and (1) other lot for future development on 16.15 acres of land in the R-15 zoning district.

Strader: With that we will move right along to Item No. 9, a public hearing for Apex Phenomenal, H-2024-0041, and open this up for further staff comments.

Allen: Madam President, Members of the Council, the next application before you is a request for a preliminary plat. This site consists of 16.15 acres of land, zoned R-15, generally located on the north side of East Lake Hazel Road approximately a quarter mile west of South Locust Grove Road. This property was annexed back in 2015 with an R-4 placeholder zoning district as part of the South Meridian Category A annexation and included in a development agreement at that time. The property was later rezoned to the R-15 zoning district in 2020 and a new development agreement was recorded that removed this property from the original agreement. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is medium high density residential, which calls for residential units at density -- gross density of eight to 12 units per acre. The applicant is requesting approval of a preliminary plat to subdivide the subject property into 64 single family residential building lots, 11 common lots and one other lot for future development. A mix of single family residential attached and detached units are proposed on the eastern half of the property, providing a mix of dwelling types at a gross density of eight units per acre, which is consistent with the density desired of eight to 12 units per acre in the medium high density residential designated area. The plat is proposed to develop in one phase. The applicant plans to resubdivide the western half of the property, Lot 76, in the future and will likely develop that area with more single family residential attached and detached units similar to those in this development. However, they are unsure at this time of the layout or the lot sizes for that area. All of the proposed units will have alley access from local and collector streets abutting the site and will front on adjacent streets or internal common MEWs. Address signage is required to be provided at the alley entrances off of the adjacent streets for homes that don't have frontage on a street. Direct lot access via East Lake Hazel Road, an arterial street, is prohibited. A traffic study was not required by ACHD. Lake Hazel Road is currently being widened to five lanes from State Highway 69 and Meridian Road to Locust Grove Road. A 25 foot wide landscape street buffer is required to be provided along Lake Hazel Road and 20 foot wide landscape street buffers are required along South Apex Avenue and South Sublimity Avenue, both collector streets. All street buffers are required to be installed with development of the subdivision. The proposed development is required to provide a minimum of 15 percent qualified open space and a minimum of two points of site amenities. Based on the eastern 8.2 acre portion of the site proposed to develop at this time, a minimum of 1.23 acres of common open space is required that meets the minimum quality and qualified standards. A total of 2.27 acres is proposed consisting of linear open space, 50 percent of the landscape buffer along Lake Hazel Road, an arterial street, one hundred percent of the landscape buffer along South Apex Avenue, a collector street, and open grassy areas of at least 5,000 square feet in area. A minimum of four points of amenities are proposed consisting of an artificial turf, multi- sport court in a central common MEW area, which meets and exceeds the standard. This

development will also have access to all other common areas and site amenities in the larger Apex Pinnacle development. The western 7.94 acres, Lot 76, proposed to be resubdivided in the future, is required to comply with the open space and site amenity standards in effect at the time of development. And those are just some plans of the site amenities and the common open space areas. Conceptual building elevations were submitted for the proposed single family attached and detached units as shown. The single family attached units require design review approval. The development agreement requires all developments to incorporate high quality architectural design and materials and thoughtful site design to ensure quality of place consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The development agreement also requires the rear or sides of two story homes on lots that faced Lake Hazel Road and South Apex Avenue to incorporate -- to incorporate articulation to break up monotonous wall plains and roof lines that are visible from the street. The Commission recommended approval of the proposed preliminary plat. Amanda McNutt from Brighton Corporation testified in favor of the application. No one testified in opposition or commented. Written testimony was received from the applicant in agreement with the staff report conditions. There was no real discussion by the Commission at the hearing and there were no changes to the staff recommendation. There are no outstanding issues for Council tonight and no written testimony has been received since the Commission hearing. The applicant is here to testify tonight. Staff will stand for any questions.

Strader: Thank you very much. Council, do you have any questions for staff? Okay. Not at this time. All right. We will go ahead and recognize the applicant. You have up to 15 minutes. Please remember to state your name and address for the record. Thank you.

McNutt: Thank you. Amanda McNutt. 2929 West Navigator Drive, Meridian, Idaho. 83642.

Strader: Go ahead and pause the applicant's time while we get the technology presentation loaded up. Bear with us.

McNutt: It won't take me long anyway All right. So, this is Apex Phenomenal. We are doing a preliminary plat. Sonya did a really great job of going over the details of this. We had our neighborhood meeting. Things went very smoothly. We don't have any comments actually throughout the entire process for this one. It will be 64 single family residential lots, with 11 common lots, on 8.2 acres and as Sonya mentioned we will have one future R-15 lot on the west side that's about 7.9 acres that will redevelop at a later date. Just some highlights of the development so far. Lake Hazel is now open, which I know has been very exciting for anyone who lives or travels that direction. Brighton's completed about two miles of roadway in that area with this Pinnacle overall development. We have a mini roundabout at Crescendo and Sublimity, which you can kind of see in this graphic and the internal street network other than the actual internal roadways and alleyways in Phenomenal are also complete. So, lots of fresh pavement out there. As mentioned this has already been zoned as R-15 and it is a medium high density residential future land use map. No changes to either of those are requested

We will be providing a variety of home choices, including single family. We call them carriage lane and paired carriage lane homes. Just another display here of the paired carriage lane. We do have about 27.6 percent open space on this west side. Again, the future R-15 will develop separately and have additional open space with that application. The star here is representative of where we plan to have our multi-sport court. This sports court is actually a little bit unique, because you can play a bunch of different sports on this, including pickleball, tennis, soccer, volleyball and really anything else that you want. We thought that would be very valuable for everybody living in these particular units, because not everybody loves pickleball, although it seems like everybody wants to put one in. Obviously, we will have lots of sidewalks connecting everything through here. Specifically I wanted to point out that we have a good north-south corridor there, which will get these residents to other portions of Apex, which are just amenity rich and most likely people are going to want to walk there. This depicts some of those areas that I'm talking about, including the Gem Prep school, which will be walkable. Discovery Park. The library and the SO/ME amphitheater, which is scheduled to open in 2025. With that we concur with the approval recommendations of staff and Planning and Zoning and I will stand for any questions.

Strader: Okay. Thank you very much. Do we have any questions for the applicant?

Little Roberts: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Uh-huh.

Little Roberts: Amanda, I just would like to say thank you. The amenities included in this are great and innovative. I'm excited to see how the sports turf works for pickleball. One of the things we get on a fairly regular basis is how noisy pickleball is and so that may have an impact on how late people can play and things like that, but I just appreciate the -- going above and beyond with the amenities.

McNutt: Thank you for that comment.

Strader: Okay. Are there any additional questions?

Taylor: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Really quick question on -- are all of the homes alley loaded the way it's designed where they will have garage access through an alley; is that correct?

McNutt: Yeah. So, we call those carriage lane --

Taylor: Okay.

McNutt: -- product, but, yes, they are an alley loaded product.

Taylor: And, then, a quick follow up --

Strader: Go ahead.

Taylor: -- if I may. Just kind of curious. Some people really -- some developers really don't like that -- would like -- would not like to have that kind of development. I have seen some that I don't like. I have seen some that I really like. I'm just kind of curious some of your thinking as to why that -- why you wanted to offer that. I think it looks very attractive. I have no -- I'm just more curious how you kind of came down with deciding to kind of pursue that type of a product.

McNutt: Yeah. Alley loaded products are unique. That's a good point. I think what it provides is the abilities for neighbors to not just go in their garage and never see their neighbors, it kind of forces people if they want to be outside to be out in their front yard and really interact with the other people in their community. So, we really feel that that's important and we are trying to build that community out there to really be an interactive community and not just people park and never see each other.

Strader: Okay. I do have a question for you, Ms. McNutt. Could you remind us about -- and I remember one of the things that came through to me during the annexation process for Pinnacle was that the applicant was actually providing school sites and actively trying to help resolve part of our school overcrowding issues in south Meridian. Could you just talk about the status of Gem Prep, where everything's at. I live in north Meridian, I don't make it down there that often, if you could just kind of run us through how those -- how those updates are going.

McNutt: Yeah. Definitely. Gem Prep's open and operational. It has been for a while. This future development -- we call it the Snoopy nose and you, hopefully, can kind of see why we call it that -- is proposed to be another school site. We are actively in discussions with the school district right now and trying to come up with a plan to get them going on that site. I don't have an exact timeline as of right now, but I would imagine submitting applications fairly soon for that.

Strader: Thank you so much. That's a fantastic update. Okay. Are there any further questions for the applicant? All right. Fantastic. This is a public hearing, but we don't have a lot of people here. Is there anyone signed up, Mr. Clerk, either here or online?

Johnson: We have Brian White signed up.

Strader: Okay. Welcome, Mr. White. If you could introduce yourself again, provide your address for the record and you will be recognized for up to three minutes.

White: Brian White. 6180 South Tarrega Lane, Meridian, Idaho. So, my nine acres is right in the middle of this Conger-Brighton. They are just -- I'm like being squeezed and a pop out like a zit, but I'm not popping out, I'm staying there.

Strader: Good.

White: I did a property boundary adjustment to -- because my house was on one acre and I had seven acres. I adjusted the boundaries so that my house could be on four acres and I'm going to attempt to develop five acres into four one acre lots. We are in the process of submitting a Comprehensive Plan amendment. I just have a question. Do you know how much it costs to submit a Comprehensive Plan amendment? About 2,200 dollars. So, I have to pay you guys to change the density on the property I have owned for 33 years so that I can put four one acre lots on it. It's a little frustrating for me. The other question I have -- I know that this doesn't butt right up against my property, but it was close. Sublimity came in -- we were anticipating they would be required, because we were told when we first approached the city about developing our property that we would have to put a stub road to every property adjacent to ours that had development potential. So, I assumed when Brighton built Sublimity that they would have to stub a road to my five acres. We put our property boundary where we are putting it so it would line up with a manhole, so we could put services there. They built the road, they didn't do a stub to Conger property and they didn't do a stub to my property and I'm just wondering how they could do that if I was told that I would be required to put a stub to every potentially development property. Are you aware of why they didn't have to do that?

Strader: I think what would be best, sir, is why don't you continue your testimony for your three minutes and, then, we will get into some of the issues that you raised.

White: Okay. Testimony regarding this, it's -- I was thinking that they were applying to change it from R-4 to R-15, but it sounds like that already happened. So, that's water under the bridge. I was going to oppose that, but it's done. So, I'm pushing -- we -- I know that Mr. Clark stated that a lot of homeowners say they are going to be there for a long time and, then, five years later they are leaving. I wish I could go through every house on Tarrega Lane and tell you what has been invested in the homes on there. People aren't leaving. We have anywhere from one to five acres and we are going to be there for a long time. Everyone's fairly new or have put a lot of money into their homes. So, I just -- I know that you approved Conger to put 6.5, which to you seems little, but it's -- it's a lot of houses that are going to be squeezing us and I guess that's my testimony.

Strader: Okay. Thank you, sir. Does anyone have any questions or comments? Okay. Why don't you go ahead and sit. I do have a question for staff. Sonya, would you mind just walking us through kind of generally how the fees work for a Comprehensive Plan amendment. I assume that the same fee schedule applies to all applicants, but perhaps you could help us to understand that component. I don't feel like that is specific to this application, but it is something I'm just curious about, if you wouldn't mind addressing it quickly.

Allen: Madam President, yes, there is an adopted fee schedule that Council approved. They do apply to all applicants the same.

Strader: Thank you. Okay. And I'm sure that city staff would be happy to follow up with you after the meeting to the extent that you have further questions regarding that. All right.

Allen: I think -- I think possibly the -- or the person testifying may have been referencing the previous application.

Strader: Yeah. I got that feeling also, but -- it felt -- it felt separate, but maybe somehow related. It is in a similar area, so I think maybe that's where it was coming from. Okay. All right. All right. Is there anyone else online that would like to provide testimony, Mr. Clerk?

Johnson: Madam Vice-President, only city staff are online.

Strader: Okay. Thank you. All right. So, with that we will invite the applicant up to close.

McNutt: Thank you. Though the one comment that he brought up about that road being accessible -- it is right of way, so it is accessible. They -- they have every right to access that road as much as anyone. Other than that I appreciate the time tonight.

Strader: Okay. Thank you. That is helpful. Any final questions for the applicant? Okay. All right. I think we are at that point in the night where it's time for -- for discussion and motions.

Little Roberts: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Uh-huh.

Little Roberts: I would move that we close the public hearing.

Overton: Second.

Strader: All right. Fantastic. We have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Overton: Council Vice-President?

Strader: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Unless anybody has any other comments I would be prepared to make a motion.

Strader: Okay.

Overton: Council Vice-President, I move that we -- after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony move we approved File No. H-2024-0041 as presented in the staff report for today's date.

Little Roberts: Second.

Strader: Okay. We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion? I will just provide a brief discussion on my part. I think as actually noted this is already annexed and zoned. So, this is a continuation of a larger development that has already been conceptually approved. The things that I like about it -- I think the density is appropriate considering the nearby amenities and in addition to that I was very appreciative that the applicant was helping to provide educational facilities in Meridian. So, I just wanted to compliment them for that.

Taylor: Madam Vice-Chair?

Strader: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Some couple of comments I think that are of interest. One, there was some enrollment numbers came out recently that showed large school districts are losing students, while online and charter schools are growing and so I do appreciate, you know, the -- there has been a lot of effort to kind of find some smaller parcels of land to allow these other forms of school to come on. So, it's -- it's a -- I really appreciate how we are addressing some of these concerns that way. I think it's also worth of note, too -- and, Mr. White, I appreciate -- I did not know how much it cost. I think it's -- I know it's certainly my priority and I could probably speak comfortably for the rest of the members of Council like to keep those fees as reasonable as they can. The reason we have those fees are to reduce the property tax burdens on other taxpayers who are not using the services of our development staff to go through those things. So, it's kind of the balance of when we are using those services to keep the burden on those people using the services, so that the tax burden for the rest of city can be kept as -- hopefully as light as possible. But I do think it's -- would appreciate, you know, when we do adopt these fee schedules in the future would love to have your perspective on it, because you are going through it, I have not and I would -- I think it's valuable, so I would just like to encourage you as much as you can to -- when we do adopt those fee schedules in the future to come participate and provide some input, because I think it's value to the Council to -- to hear that, so -- thank you.

Strader: Okay. Great. We have a motion and we have a second, so -- and is there any further discussion? Okay. With that the clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, absent; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, absent.

Strader: Okay. The ayes have it and this development for Apex Phenomenal is approved. Have a nice evening, everyone.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Strader: With that we have moved on to future meeting topics. Does anyone have a future meeting topic that they would like to discuss at this time? Okay. Going once, going twice, sold. No future meeting topics. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Overton: Council Vice-Chair, move to adjourn.

Strader: Okay. We have a motion to adjourn. All those in favor, please, signify by saying aye. And with that we are adjourned. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:50 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____/_____/_____
COUNCIL VICE-PRESIDENT LIZ STRADER DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK